

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Bright People Foods dba Dr. McDougall’s Right Foods v. Alliance
Sales & Marketing MW, Inc. and Does 1 to 20

Bright People Foods · No. 2:24-cv-00060 WBS AC · Decided December 9, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants defendants’ motion to modify the scheduling order based on a finding of sufficient diligence and good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4). The order extends expert disclosure, discovery, motion, final pretrial conference, and jury trial deadlines, while leaving all other provisions unchanged.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	William B. Shubb
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 9, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-00060 WBS AC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the scheduling order by extending expert-disclosure, discovery, motion, pretrial-conference, and trial deadlines.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), a scheduling order may be modified only for good cause, with the inquiry focusing primarily on the diligence of the party seeking modification; prejudice to the opposing party may provide an additional reason to deny modification.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether defendants established good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the scheduling order.

HOLDINGS

1. Defendants demonstrated sufficient diligence and good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to warrant modification of the scheduling order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) allows the court to modify its scheduling order for good cause.”
(1)

“The “good cause” standard focuses primarily on the diligence of the party seeking the amendment.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendants requested extensions of various scheduling-order deadlines, asserting that plaintiff's counsel had refused to provide availability for outstanding depositions. Plaintiff opposed the modifications, stating that plaintiff's counsel had been unavailable on the dates defendants proposed. The court determined that defendants had been sufficiently diligent to establish good cause.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was pending in the Eastern District of California under a previously entered scheduling order. Defendants sought modification because of difficulties coordinating outstanding depositions, and plaintiff opposed the requested changes. The court found defendants sufficiently diligent, granted the motion, and modified specified scheduling-order deadlines while leaving all other provisions unchanged.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.3d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)